



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

holiness against sin, which constitutes that penalty. While Christ's love explains his willingness to endure suffering for us, only his holiness furnishes the reason for that constitution of the universe in general and of human nature in particular which makes that suffering necessary. His sufferings are substitutionary, since his divinity and his sinlessness enable him to do for us what we could never do for ourselves. Yet this substitution is also a sharing—not the work of one external to us, but of one who is the life of humanity. This sharing, by virtue of the fact that our personality has its ground in Christ, it is the great merit of Dr. Moberly to point out; that this sharing of our penalty was necessitated by God's righteousness Dr. Moberly has failed to indicate. Scripture declares the ultimate aim of the atonement to be that God "might be just," and no theory of the atonement will meet the demands of either reason or conscience that does not ground its necessity in God's righteousness, rather than in his love.

AUGUSTUS H. STRONG.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE NEW EPOCH FOR FAITH. By GEORGE A. GORDON. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1901. Pp. xvii+412. \$1.50.

THIS book was written to show, by a study of the characteristic moods and intellectual movements of the nineteenth century, that a new era has dawned for faith in the Christian conception of God and the Christian view of the world. In the first chapter, after the introduction, the author undertakes to show that the central concern of the century is man. As witnesses he cites and discusses the French Revolution; the universal popularity of the poetry of Burns, with its ringing note of democracy; the influence of Browning, "the century's one supreme humanist;" the world-wide movement for the popularization of all higher literature; the socialistic agitation; the assimilation, by the idea of humanity, of science in general and of evolution in particular, which "has raised man to heaven instead of casting him down to hell;" the great and growing missionary activity of the universal church, which views all men of every race as possible children of God; and, lastly, the manifold and far-reaching influence of the great American republic in fostering and spreading the idea of man's dignity and value. A new appreciation of Christianity has arisen from the fact that men find Christianity in accord with the spirit of the century in its valuation of man. Not only so, Christianity has done much in making man solve the riddle of the cosmos. Man is the

interpretation of the cosmos; Christianity is the interpretation of man. The highest meaning of the universe can be known only through man, its highest product, and especially through the Man of Galilee, who is the highest instance of humanity. Man, as the interpretation of nature, becomes the revealer of God. Instead of a theology founded on "nature" is substituted a theology founded on man as the highest product of nature. Christ and Christ's Christianity are the highest, the only adequate expression of this higher theology. The chapter on "The Discipline of Doubt" is admirably suggestive and informing. Among the sources of doubt in the nineteenth century are the passionate but ever baffled quest for clearness and certainty; the desire for ultimate and ideal knowledge; the seeming indifference of the cosmos to man's ethical nature and endeavors; the naturalistic habit of mind, which is ever trying to reduce the universe to the compass of man's thought; personal temperament, and ill-fortune; and the persistent failure of all these moods to look for God through man and the best man at his best. But even doubt itself has rendered service to faith. It has eliminated superstition from men's minds and corrected many wrong views. It has given to the negative mood its strongest possible expression. And a doubt is really and finally answered only when it is met and answered in its strongest form. Perhaps the most signal service that has been rendered by doubt is the reorganization of knowledge and the discovery of a deeper philosophy of knowledge. Hume's destructive criticism reasoned philosophy into an eternal silence. She had to find a new set of principles before she could open her mouth. This is just what she did. Hume's merciless and absolute negation led to Kant's critical construction, and this to the idealistic philosophy of Kant's successors, which, reconstructed by British and American thinkers, is wholly on the side of man's higher spiritual interests.

And so there is a return to faith, due to the idea of humanity, elucidated and emphasized by Christianity; to the resurgence of conscious religious need; to the influence of an idealistic philosophy; and to the illustration and confirmation which a new reading of history gives to the principles on which faith ultimately rests. This return is not to faith in the old orthodoxies, like Calvinism, or the old heterodoxies, like Unitarianism, but to faith in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This admirable book is unnecessarily burdened with matter which, though good in itself, is not strictly germane to the discussion. For

this reason it is not always easy to trace the main current of the thought. The book is, therefore, hard to read at first, but it grows clearer and better with each reading, and when one comes to understand its method, even the sections which are not strictly relevant become suggestive and valuable. It is difficult to recall a book that abounds more with pregnant suggestions, or that contains so many and excellent summaries and estimates of men, books, movements, systems. The reader of severe taste will find the style in some places diffuse and over-rhetorical. But no man can read the book understandingly without thanking the gifted and genial author with all his heart for the distinct and decided benefit which it abundantly affords.

GROSS ALEXANDER.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,  
Nashville, Tenn.

THEOLOGIE UND METAPHYSIK. Das Verhältnis der Theologie zur modernen Erkenntnistheorie und Psychologie. Von GEORG WOBBERMIN. Berlin: Duncker, 1901. Pp. xii+291. M. 4.80.

THE author begins by pointing out the close relation which subsists (and should be recognized as subsisting) between theology and metaphysic, on the one hand, and between both of these and epistemology, on the other. Theology and metaphysic are occupied to a very large extent with the same fundamental questions. They stand, therefore, to that extent, upon common ground. But the relation of both to epistemology is no less close and vital; and this relation has been clearly recognized by modern philosophers, though not always by modern theologians. Now, in what sense can the transcendent realities with which theology and metaphysic have to do, be objects of knowledge for our consciousness? All experience points to such transcendent realities; but experience in the ordinary sense does not reveal them, or make them objects of positive knowledge. Two fallacious lines of reasoning are then pointed out and criticised: (1) *Empirio-Kriticismus*, which obliterates altogether the distinction between immanent and transcendent, and between subject and object, and reduces all reality to *Umgebungsbestandtheilen*. The teaching of Avenarius is really materialism, in spite of its author's assertions to the contrary. (2) *Ritschlianism*, which rests too completely upon subjective factors, and fails to vindicate the essential objectivity and supra-phenomenal character of the objects of Christian faith. These objects